



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

SP

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/770,994	01/25/2001	Trung M. Tran	5181-78600	7544
7590	03/07/2005		EXAMINER	
B. Noel Kivlin Conley, Rose & Tayon, P.C. P. O. Box 398 Austin, TX 78767-0398			DALENCOURT, YVES	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2157	

DATE MAILED: 03/07/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	09/770,994	TRAN, TRUNG M.	
	Examiner Yves Dalencourt	Art Unit 2157	

— The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address —
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 18 October 2004.
- 2a) This action is FINAL. 2b) This action is non-final.
- 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) Claim(s) 1-51 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) Claim(s) 1-51 is/are rejected.
- 7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) The drawing(s) filed on 25 January 2001 is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.
 Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
 Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
 - a) All b) Some * c) None of:
 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

This office action is responsive to amendment filed on 10/18/2004.

Response to Amendment

The examiner has acknowledged the amended abstract.

Response to Arguments

1. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1 - 51 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Drawings

2. The drawings are objected to under 37 CFR 1.83(a). The drawings must show every feature of the invention specified in the claims. Therefore, "**the second computer communicating with the server computer system**"(claims 33, 36, and 38) must be shown or the feature(s) canceled from the claim(s). No new matter should be entered.

Corrected drawing sheets in compliance with 37 CFR 1.121(d) are required in reply to the Office action to avoid abandonment of the application. Any amended replacement drawing sheet should include all of the figures appearing on the immediate prior version of the sheet, even if only one figure is being amended. The figure or figure number of an amended drawing should not be labeled as "amended." If a drawing figure is to be canceled, the appropriate figure must be removed from the replacement sheet, and where necessary, the remaining figures must be renumbered and appropriate

changes made to the brief description of the several views of the drawings for consistency. Additional replacement sheets may be necessary to show the renumbering of the remaining figures. Each drawing sheet submitted after the filing date of an application must be labeled in the top margin as either "Replacement Sheet" or "New Sheet" pursuant to 37 CFR 1.121(d). If the changes are not accepted by the examiner, the applicant will be notified and informed of any required corrective action in the next Office action. The objection to the drawings will not be held in abeyance.

Specification

1. The disclosure is objected to because it contains an embedded hyperlink and/or other form of browser-executable code (page 13, line 22). Applicant is required to delete the embedded hyperlink and/or other form of browser-executable code. See MPEP § 608.01.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

3. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

4. Claims 1 – 6, 8 – 21, 23 – 32, and 42 - 51 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over De Greef et al (US 6,549,217; hereinafter De Greef) in view of Paul A. Smethers (US 20030055870; hereinafter Smethers).

Regarding claims 1 - 2, 10, 12, 14 - 15, 18, 26, 29, 42, 45, and 48, De Greef teaches a client computer system and method for connection to a server computer system via a network (figs. 3A-3B; col. 10, lines 42 - 44), the client computer system comprising a processor (50, fig. 3A); a memory coupled to the processor (col. 10, lines 44 – 48); receive user authentication information from the user (col. 11, lines 44 - 45); communicate with the server computer system to authenticate the user, using the user authentication information (col. 11, lines 35 - 46); send the bookmark information for storage in association with the user by the server computer system (paragraph bridging col. 11, line 55 through col. 12, line 7).

De Greef teaches substantially all the limitations, but fails to specifically teach that the processor of the client computer system is operable to execute program instructions stored in the memory to receive user input from a user specifying bookmark information, wherein the bookmark information specifies a uniform resource locator (URL) (claim 1); wherein said receiving user input from the user specifying bookmark information comprises receiving user input requesting to bookmark the URL (claim 2).

However, Smethers teaches, in the same field of endeavor, a remote bookmarking for wireless client devices, wherein the processor of the client computer system is operable to execute program instructions stored in the memory to receive user input from a user specifying bookmark information, wherein the bookmark information specifies a uniform resource locator (URL) (fig. 4; paragraphs [0069] and [0077]); wherein said receiving user input from the user specifying bookmark

information comprises receiving user input requesting to bookmark the URL (paragraph [0069], lines 15 – 18) .

Thus, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have modify De Greef's device by incorporating a processor, which receives user input from a user specifying bookmark information, wherein the bookmark information specifies a uniform resource locator (URL); and wherein said receiving user input from the user specifying bookmark information comprises receiving user input requesting to bookmark the URL as evidenced by Smethers for the purpose of enabling a wireless client device to implement bookmarks with improved transmission efficiency, less navigation actions and/or reduced amounts of memory resources, thereby, selecting bookmarks with greater speed and ease.

Regarding claim 3, De Greef and Smethers teach all the limitations on claim 1, and De Greef further teaches a client computer system and method for connection to a server computer system via a network (figs. 3A-3B), wherein the processor of the client computer system is further operable to execute program instructions stored in the memory to retrieve the bookmark information from the server computer system, subsequently to said sending the bookmark information to the server computer system (col. 11, lines 15 - 25).

Regarding claim 4, De Greef and Smethers teach all the limitations on claim 3, and De Greef further teaches a client computer system and method for connection to a server computer system via a network (figs. 3A-3B), wherein the processor of the client computer system is operable to execute a software application; wherein said sending

the bookmark information comprises the software application executing in the client computer system sending the bookmark information; wherein said retrieving the bookmark information comprises the software application executing in the client computer system retrieving the bookmark information (col. 10, lines 24 - 67).

Regarding claims 5, 11, 27, and 43, De Greef and Smethers teach all the limitations on claims 1, 10, 26, 42, and De Greef further teaches a client computer system and method for connection to a server computer system via a network (figs. 3A-3B), wherein the software application executing in the client computer system is operable to enable a user to access the retrieved bookmark information via a graphical user interface of the software application (col. 3, lines 4 – 31).

Regarding claims 6, 13, 21, 28, and 44, De Greef and Smethers teach all the limitations on claims 1, 10, 26, 42, and De Greef further teaches a client computer system and method for connection to a server computer system via a network (figs. 3A-3B), wherein said enabling the user to access the bookmark information via a graphical user interface comprises enabling the user to access the bookmark information via a menu (paragraph bridging col. 4, line 57 through col. 5, line 9).

Regarding claims 8, 16, 23, 31, 46, and 50, De Greef and Smethers teach all the limitations on claims 1, 10, 26, 42, and De Greef further teaches a client computer system for connection to a server computer system via a network (figs. 3A-3B), wherein said communicating with the server computer system to authenticate the user is performed using the Lightweight Directory Access Protocol (LDAP) (col. 16, lines 32 - 47).

Regarding claims 9, 17, 24, 32, 47, and 51, De Greef and Smethers teach all the limitations on claims 1, 10, 26, 42, and De Greef further teaches a client computer system for connection to a server computer system via a network (figs. 3A-3B), wherein said sending the bookmark information for storage by the server computer system is performed using the Lightweight Directory Access Protocol (LDAP) (col. 16, lines 32 - 47).

Regarding claims 19, 20, and 30, De Greef and Smethers teach all the limitations on claims 18, 28, and De Greef further teaches a client computer system for connection to a server computer system via a network (figs. 3A-3B), wherein said receiving the user input specifying the bookmark information and said sending the bookmark information for storage by the server computer system are performed by a first computer system, the method further comprising a second computer system retrieving the bookmark information from the server computer system (fig. 4; col. 11, lines 26 – 54).

Regarding claim 25, De Greef and Smethers teach all the limitations on claim 18, and De Greef further teaches a client computer system for connection to a server computer system via a network (figs. 3A-3B), wherein, in storing the bookmark information, the server computer system is operable to add the bookmark information to existing bookmark information that is already stored for the user (col. 7, lines 12 – 34).

Claims 7, 22, and 49 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over De Greef et al (US 6,549,217; hereinafter De Greef) in view of Paul A. Smethers

(US 20030055870; hereinafter Smethers), and further in view of Mendelevitch et al (EP 1030247 A2; hereinafter Mendelevitch).

Regarding claims 7, 22, and 49, De Greef and Smethers teach all the limitations on claims 1, 18, and 48, but fail to specifically teach the idea of determining whether the user wants to store the bookmark information locally or remotely in response to said receiving the user input requesting to store the bookmark information; store the bookmark information locally if the user wants to store the bookmark information locally, and said sending the bookmark information for storage by the server computer system if the user wants to store the bookmark information remotely.

However, Mendelevitch et al (EP 1030247 A2) teaches, in the same field of endeavor, a system and method for sharing bookmark information, which discloses the idea of determining whether the user wants to store the bookmark information locally or remotely in response to said receiving the user input requesting to store the bookmark information; store the bookmark information locally if the user wants to store the bookmark information locally, and said sending the bookmark information for storage by the server computer system if the user wants to store the bookmark information remotely (paras. 0005, 0026 – 0028, and 0031 – 0035).

Thus, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the combination of De Greef and Smethers's device by determining whether the user wants to store the bookmark information locally or remotely in response to said receiving the user input requesting to store the bookmark information; store the bookmark information locally if the user wants to store the

Art Unit: 2157

bookmark information locally, and said sending the bookmark information for storage by the server computer system if the user wants to store the bookmark information remotely as evidenced by Mendelevitch et al (EP 1030247 A2) for the purpose of avoiding transmission delays for the bookmark information, especially when available bandwidth between client(s) and server is low during periods of peak usage; thereby providing an efficient and reliable client/server system.

5. Claims 33 - 41 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Paul A. Smethers (US 20030055870; hereinafter Smethers) in view of Mendelevitch et al (EP 1030247 A2; hereinafter Mendelevitch).

Regarding claims 33 - 41, Smethers teaches a method for sharing bookmark information among different computer systems (fig. 2), the method comprising a first computer system receiving user input specifying bookmark information, wherein the bookmark information specifies a uniform resource locator (URL)(paragraphs [0069] and [0077]; the first computer system communicating with a server computer system in order to store the bookmark information on the server computer system (paragraph [0069], lines 15 - 24).

Smethers teaches substantially all the limitations, but fails to specifically teach a second computer system communicating with the server computer system in order to retrieve the stored bookmark information; and receiving information from a first computer that specifies a particular user and stores the bookmark information in association with the particular user, and a request for the bookmark information from the second client computer system that specifies the same particular user.

However, Mendelevitch et al (EP 1030247 A2) teaches, in the same field of endeavor, a system and method for sharing bookmark information, which discloses a second computer system communicating with the server computer system in order to retrieve the stored bookmark information; and receiving information from a first computer that specifies a particular user and stores the bookmark information in association with the particular user, and a request for the bookmark information from the second client computer system that specifies the same particular user (paras. 0005, 0026 – 0028, and 0031 – 0035).

Thus, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Smethers's device by incorporating a second computer system communicating with the server computer system in order to retrieve the stored bookmark information; and receiving information from a first computer that specifies a particular user and stores the bookmark information in association with the particular user, and a request for the bookmark information from the second client computer system that specifies the same particular user as evidenced by Mendelevitch et al (EP 1030247 A2) for the purpose of avoiding transmission delays for the bookmark information, especially when available bandwidth between client(s) and server is low during periods of peak usage; thereby providing an efficient and reliable client/server system.

Contact Information

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Yves Dalencourt whose telephone number is (571) 272-3998. The examiner can normally be reached on M-TH 7:30AM - 6:00PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Ario Etienne can be reached on (571) 272-4001. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Yves Dalencourt


February 20, 2005